His language is choice and clear. The tone of his work is apprecia-
tive. Furthermore, he has succeeded in putting himself into the
German atmosphere, a thing absolutely necessary for understanding
and interpreting a form of literature so subjective as the lyric.

<div align="right">H. W. PUCKETT.</div>

University of Illinois.

SOME PARALLEL FORMATIONS IN ENGLISH, by Francis
A. Wood. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913; Balti-
more: The Johns Hopkins Press. (Hesperia, Ergänzungsreihe:
Schriften zur englischen Philologie, herausgegeben von Hermann
Collitz und James W. Bright, 1. Heft.)

*ZUR GESCHICHTE DER GERMANISCHEN N-DEKLINA-
TION.* Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktor-
würde einer Hohen Philosophischen Fakultät der Kgl. Univer-
sität Uppsala vorgelegt von Elias Wessén. Uppsala 1914, Aka-
demische Buchdruckerei, Edv. Berling.

NOMINA AGENTIS IN OLD ENGLISH, PART I. Inaugural
Dissertation by Karl Kärre . . . . . for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy. Upsala 1915, printed at the University
Press, Edv. Berling.

*THE SEMANTIC DEVELOPMENT OF WORDS FOR EATING
AND DRINKING IN GERMANIC*, by H. O. Schwabe.
(Linguistic Studies in Germanic, edited by Francis A. Wood,
No. 1.) The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois
(1915).

Professor Wood's monograph deals with *k*-formations and *p*-for-
mations in English. The examples in each of these two groups
are divided according to their earliest occurrence in Old English,
Middle English or Modern English, those under each head being
given in alphabetical order. The material makes it plain that *-ock*
(e. g., *bullock*, *hassock*) "was, perhaps we may say is, a living suffix
in provincial English," and that to a lesser degree the same is
true of *-up* (e. g., *hiccup*, *wallop*), which often occurs as a parallel
of *-ock* (*hiccup:hickock*). With each example Wood cites the words
without the suffix that may be supposed to have underlain the for-
mation.

The presentation of the material is encumbered and the result
obscured by the inclusion of words like E. *black*, *yoke*, *warp*, which
from the English or even the general Germanic point of view, have
nothing to do with the types *hassock* and *hiccup*. The fact that
by the side of these words there are, either in Gic. or in some other
Indo-European language, others without the final velar or labial
(e. g., E. *yoke*, Sk. *yugám*: Sk. *yuváti* 'bindet an, spannt an') is

not directly relevant to a description of the E. words in -*ock* and
-*up*. To be sure, if one were tracing in detail the history of the
latter formation, one would presumably come to a few Primitive
IE words with vowel plus *g* or *b* at the end of a disyllabic stem
(Wood cites, for instance, Gr. πτέρυξ), and these words would, if
occurring beside others without the *g* or *b* (Gr. πτέρον), bring one
to a consideration of *g* or *b* as a general "root-determinative" in
Primitive IE,—and here Sk. *yugám*, E. *yoke*; Sk. *yuváti* would
come into the discussion. As Wood on p. 1 recalls some of the -*g*
forms of other IE languages and on p. 52 ff. gives an extensive list
of -*b*-forms, this is the place where words like E. *yoke, black, warp*
should have been mentioned.

In general, the historical aspect of the phenomenon is not sharp-
ly enough kept in view throughout the treatment, although on p. 55
f. it is briefly expressed; "In many cases this *p* comes from IE *b*.
In others it was a later addition after the analogy of traditional
forms with *p*." The same holds true of words in -*ock*; here, too,
there was a limited number of Primitive IE words in -*ug-, -ugo-*, etc.,
and the number has in English grown analogically—a growth which
might have been traced in greater detail.

Wessén's dissertation deals with two groups of Gic. substantive
en-stems derived from strong verbs: the nouns of action (e. g., OHG
sterbo 'pestilentia,' OE *fnora* 'Niesen') and the nouns denoting a
concrete object produced by the action, *nomina acti* (e. g. OHG
bizzo OE *bita* 'Bissen,' OHG *snita* 'Schnitte, Bischen'). After a full
and clear-cut list of the words in question, Wessén develops his views
as to the origin of the two types.

The author believes that they are the result of a phonetic coinci-
dence of old action-nouns and nouns of result or product in -*eno-, -ono*
(e. g., Sk. *rácanam* 'das Ordnen,' Goth. *ragin* 'Beschlusz,' Brug-
mann, *Grundrisz*,[2] 2, 1, 266) with the *en*-declension nouns in certain
case-forms, such as the nominative singular masculine, where P.
Gic. *-*enoz* would give ON -*e* (Runic *haitinar* ON *heitenn* are ana-
logic, following the rest of the paradigm), coinciding with the nom.
sg. of the masc. *en*-stems (ON *hane*). In West Gic. the acc. sg.
masc., for instance, of an *ono*-stem (OS *gaman*) coincides phoneti-
cally, wherever no analogic factor interferes, with that of an -*en* stem
(OS *bodan*, beside -*on, -un*, nom. *boda*.) Thus the *eno-, ono*-stems,
from P. IE times nouns of action and of object produced, got into
the *en*-declension in Gic.

While this is possible, there is much that speaks against it. The
contact, increasing in historical times, between "strong" and
"weak" nouns involves rather the *o*-stems and the like, than the
eno-, ono-stems; the stem-syllable of the latter has, moreover, usually
a high-grade vowel, that of the *en*-stems *actionis* and *acti* mostly
low-grade (cf. Wessén, p. 158). Wessén came very close to a better
explanation when he drew into comparison (p. 135 ff.) the so-called
indeclinable adjectives of ON, e. g., *sam-dóma*, 'einig in einem Ur-

teile,' *lítel-magne* 'schwach, kraftlos,' *ǫ́r-sauþe* 'wer keine Schafe
besitzt,' etc.   These, of course, are crystallized forms of *en*-stems,
and, as by their side Wessén finds *eno*-stems (past participles),
e. g., not only *vit-stola* but also *vit-stolenn* 'bereft of wits,' he feels
supported in the above-mentioned conclusion that the *en*-stems
arose out of the *eno*-stems.   For the indeclinable adjectives this
conclusion is, however, in all likelihood wrong.   Wessén should
have noticed that they are, nearly of all them, exocentric compounds
(*'having* a common opinion, little strength,' etc.).   Now, compound
words in Gic. are sometimes *en*-stems even though the simple word
corresponding to the final member is not an *en*-stem (Grimm 2, 542;
Brugmann, *Gr.²*, 2, 1, 146. 305; Jacobi, *Compositum und Nebensatz*,
13).   This form of extended composition is possibly of P. IE age,
for a few similar cases occur in Sk. (Wackernagel, *Ai. Gr.*, 2, 1, 94 f.);
the extension of the stem in exocentric compounds is, in general, of
course, an inherited feature (e. g., Gr. ὁμο-πάτριος, ON *sam-feðr*,
Brugmann, *op. cit.*, p. 112 ff.).   The *en*-suffixation was favored in
Gic. by the adjectival value of the compounds.   Non-possessive
examples like *her-nume* 'Kriegsgefangener' are analogic imitations of
genuine possessives like *vit-stola* 'bereft of wits' made on the model
of unextended compounds, in which exocentric and non-exocentric
meaning existed side by side (e. g., ON *stór-hǫgg* n. 'stort Hug,'
stórhǫggr adj. 'dygtig til at hugge,' Fritzner).   The forms with par-
ticiple as second member, on the other hand, are not so old: in P.
IE. time they were probably impossible (so, for instance, in Sk.,
Wackernagel, *op. cit.* 2, 1, 195) and their origin is due to an ana-
logic extension: originally, participial compounds were formed only
in non-exocentric meaning and only with verbal prefixes and cer-
tain particles (privative, comitative, meliorative, and pejora-
tive) as first member.   Modern German preserves the old state of
things in allowing only such types of participle-compounds as
gebaut, erbaut, aufgebaut, wohl-, gutgebaut, schlechtgebaut, ungesehen;
wohl-, gut-, and *schlecht-* being substitutes, ultimately, for P. IE
*(e)su (Sk. *su-*, Gr. εὐ-) and **dus-*, (Sk.*dus-*, Gr. δυσ-, Gic. Goth. *tuz-*).
In other dialects the model of non-participial compounds, in which
these particles occurred as first members (e. g., ON *for-gangr*
'auctoritas,' *sam-dóma, ǫ́r-sauþe*) by the side of adjectives and sub-
stantives (e. g. ON *skóg-gangr* 'exilium', *lítel-magne*), brought about
an extension by which the participial compounds also were used
with nominal first members: so in E. *god-given,handmade,* and an
imaginable exocentric *wit-bereft,* and in ON *her-numenn* 'taken by
an army' and exocentric *vit-stolenn* 'bereft of wits' (cf. the limited
extensions in German with adjectival first member: *weichgesotten,
krummgeschlagen,* etc.).   The ON indeclinable adjectives are thus
a far older formation than the corresponding participial com-
pounds and represent, indeed,—through analogic use of the second
member with *en*-inflection as a simple word—one of the sources of
the *en*-stems of action and product.

Such limitations of wider outlook as are involved in Wessén's neglect of the history of these compounds, are, however, entirely pardonable in a first essay—and by all means so, when, as in this case, the collection and arrangement of material are excellent, the exposition is clear and to the point, and when, above all, the writer shows familiarity with the technique of linguistic research. The dissertation, by the way, is written in excellent German.

Even greater technical talent and training are shown in Kärre's dissertation (written in excellent English) on Old English nouns of agent. Kärre is especially careful to determine the mobility of each formation; he disposes first of the obsolete suffixes and then, in the rest of the study, which deals with *l*-suffixes and with the participial *end*-suffix— the dissertation is part one of an intended larger work— he constantly distinguishes between more or less living types, determines the exact semantic and stylistic value of the forms, and looks ahead into the ME development. In other words, he gives real linguistic history, not mere enumeration. Thus, at the end of the work we find a historical survey, beginning with a list of the *end*-nouns common to more than one Gic. dialect (*fēond, frēond*, etc.), and going on to a tabular chronological review of the OE occurrences. Kärre's result is not only in itself interesting, but also of methodic significance: (p. 214) "There evidently existed in OE two strata of *end*-nouns: one old group, inherited from prim. Teutonic times, and one group of new-formations, made at different times during the Anglo-Saxon period" and (p. 228) "Even at the beginning of the OE period, there existed some few *end*-nouns, in prose chiefly law terms (*āȝend, būend, tēond, sēmend, wealdend*), in poetry chiefly formations only used as last elements of cpp. and early assuming the character of kennings.[1] The latter type was at once turned to extensive use, and a very large number of agential kennings in *-end*, chiefly cp. words, developed in OE poetry. But in prose, too, especially in those texts that were translated from Latin, a number of *end*-nouns made their appearance, Ælfred increasing the stock of such words considerably. The suffix became a frequently employed means for the formation of words designating the Deity, and also of words denoting the performance of an action of a more abstract kind, the translators of Latin works subsequent to Ælfred creating many a new *end*-noun of this semological type. In the latest OE works, the occurence of *end*-nouns seems to have decreased somewhat, and the number of new-formations is also somewhat smaller; I leave out of consideration glosses, in which *end*-nouns abound down to the very last. Yet it is a characteristic feature of almost all OE *end*-nouns that they were never words of everyday use (colloquial character), but were ex-

[1] E. g., *ealodrincende, heallsittende*. (L. B.)

clusively literary words. . . . . The *end*-nouns clearly bear
the stamp of being occasional formations. . . . . " He then
shows briefly how the *end*-nouns die out in ME.

Kärre gives also a valuable "excursus" on the inflection of these
words: the forms with adjectival endings belong especially to the
poetic words, almost all compounds and used in the pl. (e. g.,
sæ-līðende, sg. *sæ-lida*); the genuine substantives used in prose rarely
receive the adjectival inflection.

It will be apparent that we have here the kind of contribution to
Gic. morphology which, in the present state of things and within
the limitations of a doctor's thesis, is of the greatest value: a
definite problem discussed with complete material and careful his-
torical scrutiny. As a doctoral dissertation, it must, however,
be added, Kärre's work in both size and quality is far above the
average.

It is disappointing to turn from these two Swedish dissertations
to the Chicago dissertation of Schwabe. It is a list of Gic. words
for Eating and Drinking arranged in sixty-three groups according
to the meaning out of which that of Eating or Drinking is supposed
to have developed. The work is carefully done, but brings, so far
as I can see, no result whatever. The semantic relations are familiar
and obvious, and morphologic or etymologic discussion there is none.
A similar semantic study about some more abstract meaning (such
as Speaking and Saying, cf. Buck, AJP. 36, 1 ff. 125 ff.) is of
value; an investigation of the *Wörter und Sachen* kind (e. g., Build-
ing and House, Basket and Crib, Dish and Jar) would have been
of the utmost interest;[2] it is indeed regrettable that in the vast
domain of Gic. linguistics, where unsolved problems of the greatest
interest beckon on all sides, a student should confine himself to so
arid and unprofitable a task.

[2] *Modern Philology* announces an article by Dr. Schwabe on Gic. Coin Names,
a subject which should be productive of valuable results.

<div align="right">LEONARD BLOOMFIELD.</div>

University of Illinois.

ENGLISH TRAVELLERS OF THE RENAISSANCE. By
  Clare Howard. London. John Lane, the Bodley Head.
  1914. 8vo, pp. xviii, 233.

The description and criticism of travel literature is a field into
which, so far as we know, few incursions have as yet been made.
Probably not many are aware of the large number of works on
travel, or in some way concerned with travel, published between
1550 and 1800. Some notion of the extent of this body of litera-
ture may be gained from the fact that John Pinkerton's list, pub-
lished in 1814, filled 255 quarto pages, which Professor Mead, in